

this addition, the intended meaning of metal extrusion profile can now be considered; and the rejections on Osten and Haas, which do not suggest extrusions, can now be withdrawn. This results in claims 12-25 and 29-52 being allowable.

The office action asked about structure set forth in applicants' claims on the freely pivotal nature of the support arms. The answer involves the claiming of support arms that hang in downwardly dependent or inwardly dependent positions when not supporting the sash, which is not true of Osten's outwardly biased arms. The claims also recite that outwardly extended positions of the support arms occur in response to supporting weight of the sash, whereas Osten's support arms move to their outwardly extending positions in response to spring force.

The office action argues that the claims contain no limitations about the sash weight being applied "directly below the shoes." (This slightly misstates the claimed arrangement, which applies the sash weight to the shoes and not somewhere below the shoes.) The claims do recite limitations about the sash weight resting on the shoes in positions vertically under counterbalance elements, and some of the claims further define such a sash weight support as minimizing moment arms tending to turn the shoes around a horizontal axis. There is ample and specific structural recitation of the sash weight being supported vertically below the counterbalance elements, and the consequence of such support, so that the scope of the claims is indeed commensurate with applicants' arguments.

Consideration of the many claim limitations involving the sash support weight being vertically under the counterbalance elements allows rejections on Osten and Haas to be withdrawn, since both of these references suggest sash weight offset from the counterbalance elements to produce moment arms tending to rotate the shoes horizontally, for locking purposes. Withdrawal of these rejections results in allowance of claims 1-11, 53-60, and 67-90.

This leaves claims 61-66 on shoe locking hooks that are pivotal between latched and unlatched positions against jamb lances. Neither Osten nor Haas suggests hooks for shoe latches or lances

formed in jambs for the locking hooks to engage. Moreover, neither reference suggests a locking element that is latched out of locking engagement. The office action mischaracterizes Haas as suggesting a spring latch 70 retaining a hook in an undeployed position. The spring of Haas biases a locking element constantly to a locking position. There is no suggestion in Haas for any latching in an unlocking position, that the locking element be a hook, or that the hook engage a lance formed in a jamb. These clear differences from the art make the rejection of claims 61-66 withdrawable.

When claim limitations are fully considered as explained above, all the rejections can be withdrawn and all the claims can be allowed. For any question on this, the Examiner is invited to call applicants' attorney at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,  
EUGENE STEPHENS & ASSOCIATES



Eugene S. Stephens, Reg. No. 20,649  
56 Windsor Street  
Rochester, New York 14605  
Phone: (716) 232-7700  
Facsimile: (716) 232-7188

ESS:p/c

Dated: 5 April 1999

**CERTIFICATE OF MAILING**

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited on the date shown below with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail in an envelope addressed to the Assistant Commissioner for Patents, Washington, D.C., 20231.

Date of Deposit: 5 April 1999

Signature: 